

Serial No. 09/923,501  
Amdt. dated October 15, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of June 16, 2004

Attorney Docket No. LX00093

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 through 7 and 9 through 12 remain in this application. Claim 8 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. In addition, claim 7 has been amended.

Claims 1 through 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,119,296 to Zheng, et al. ("Zheng, et al. patent") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,356,258 to Kato, et al. ("Kato, et al. patent").

Claim 1 provides a first row of input keys, a second row of input keys adjacent to the first row, and a third row of input keys adjacent to the second row, wherein each key of the first row represents a linear character stroke, each key of the third row represents a non-linear character stroke, and the second row includes at least one key representing a linear character stroke and at least one key representing a non-linear character stroke.

The Zheng, et al. patent describes three rows of input keys adjacent to one another as shown in FIG. 6 and, also, linear character strokes corresponding to input keys 1 through 4 and non-linear character strokes corresponding to input keys 5 and 6 as shown in FIG. 1. However, the Zheng, et al. patent does not describe or suggest each key of one row of keys representing a linear character stroke and each key of another row of keys represents a non-linear character stroke, as required by claim 1. Likewise, the Kato, et al. patent does not describe or suggest each key of one row of keys representing a linear character stroke and each key of another row of keys represents a non-linear character stroke, as required by claim 1.

Serial No. 09/923,501  
Amdt. dated October 15, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of June 16, 2004

Attorney Docket No. LX00093

The above Office Action states that "Zheng does not disclose expressly, the rows, however he discloses a keypad. (fig. 6; col. 15; 21-35) which includes the three rows". Even so, the Zheng, et al. patent does not describe or suggest each key of one row of keys representing a linear character stroke and each key of another row of keys represents a non-linear character stroke, as required by claim 1. For one reason, no particular row of the keyboard shown in FIG. 6 represents a linear character stroke for each key of the row, and no particular row represents a non-linear character stroke for each key of the row. For another reason, the table shown in FIG. 1 does not indicate which row, if any, to associate with each stroke of the table. For yet another reason, the Zheng, et al. patent does not provide any indication that the strokes of the table of FIG. 1 may be mapped to the keyboard of FIG. 6. Therefore, claim 1 distinguishes patentably from the Zheng, et al. patent, the Kato, et al. patent, and the suggested combination of these patents.

Claims 2 through 6 depend from and include all limitations of independent claim 1. Therefore, claims 2 through 6 distinguish patentably from the Zheng, et al. patent, the Kato, et al. patent, and the suggested combination of these patents for the reasons stated above for independent claim 1.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1 through 6 are respectfully requested.

Claims 7 and 9 through 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,790,055 to Yu ("Yu patent") in view of the Kato, et al. patent.

Serial No. 09/923,501  
Amdt. dated October 15, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of June 16, 2004

Attorney Docket No. I.X00093

Claim 7 as amended provides, *inter alia*, each key of input key 1, input key 2 and input key 3 represents a single linear character stroke; and each key of input key 7, input key 8 and input key 9 represents a non-linear character stroke. In contrast, the Yu patent describes a keypad (FIG. 8) with an input key 3 having two linear character strokes. The Yu patent and the Kato, et al. patent, individually or in combination, do not describe or suggest each key of input key 1, input key 2 and input key 3 representing a single linear character stroke, as required by claim 7 as amended. Therefore, claim 7 distinguishes patenably from the Yu patent, the Kato, et al. patent, and the suggested combination of these patents.

Claims 9 through 12 depend from and include all limitations of independent claim 7. Therefore, claims 9 through 12 distinguish patenably from the Yu patent, the Kato, et al. patent, and the suggested combination of these patents for the reasons stated above for independent claim 7.

In addition, claims 10 and 11 further distinguish from the cited references and their suggested combination. Claim 10 provides, *inter alia*, input key 5 represents a non-linear character stroke. In contrast, as shown in FIG. 8, the Yu patent discloses an input key 5 having a linear character stroke and, as shown in FIG. 14, the input key 5 corresponds to a left-to-right downstroke. Neither the Yu patent nor the Kato, et al. patent describe or suggest a non-linear character stroke represented by input key 5, as required by claim 10. Claim 11 provides, *inter alia*, input key 6 also represents a linear character stroke. In contrast, as shown in FIG. 8, the Yu patent discloses an input key 6 having a non-linear character stroke and, as shown in FIG. 14, the input key 6 corresponds to a semi circle stroke. Neither the Yu patent nor the Kato, et al. patent

Serial No. 09/923,501  
Amdt. dated October 15, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of June 16, 2004

Attorney Docket No. LX00093

describe or suggest a linear character stroke represented by input key 6, as required by claim 11. Therefore, claims 10 and 11 further distinguish patenably from the Yu patent, the Kato, et al. patent, and the suggested combination of these patents.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 7 and 9 through 12 are respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any additional fees arising as a result of this response, including any fees for Extensions of Time, or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any


Serial No. 09/923,501  
Amdt. dated October 15, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of June 16, 2004

Attorney Docket No. LX00093

questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,  
Guo, Jin, et al.

Please forward all correspondence to:  
Motorola, Inc.  
Law Department (HDW)  
600 North US Highway 45, AS437  
Libertyville, IL 60048

  
Hisashi D. Watanabe  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 37,465  
Telephone: (847) 523-2322  
Facsimile: (847) 523-2350

10/15/04

Date